



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

On 01/03/03

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: Michael Newell

Docket No.: 014058-01.6300US

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

JAN 15 2003

RECEIVED

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

JORY R. BALDRIDGE et al.

Application No.: 10/068,398

Filed: February 4, 2002

For: PROPHYLACTIC AND
THERAPEUTIC TREATMENT OF
INFECTIOUS AND OTHER DISEASES
WITH IMMUNOEFFECTOR
COMPOUNDS

Examiner: Leigh C. Maier

Art Unit: 1623

ELECTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Requirement for Restriction dated November 5, 2002,
Applicants elect to prosecute method-of use claims 1-44 and 61-63, with traverse.

Applicants submit that the compositions and methods of use are classified
in the same class and subclass, so that searching both in the same application would
produce no burden on the examiner.

In addition, while the examiner states that the compositions may be used
in materially different processes, this conclusion is supported only because the examiner
seeks to divide the generic claims to methods of ameliorating or substantially preventing
certain conditions in a subject into different methods. However, as stated below,
Applicants submit that, in the absence of prior art, they are entitled to generic claims as